



Justin S. Weddle
212 - 997 - 5518 (o)
347 - 421 - 2062 (m)
jweddle@weddlelaw.com

February 21, 2023

By ECF

Honorable Edgardo Ramos
United States District Judge
Southern District of New York
40 Foley Square
New York, New York 10007

Re: **United States v. Karl Sebastian Greenwood, S5 17 Cr. 630 (ER)**

Dear Judge Ramos:

We respectfully submit this letter with the consent of the prosecutors (the prosecutors' consent is conditioned on the defense noting herein that the prosecution may seek to file a sur-reply) to request an enlargement of time and length for the defense reply brief on the *Azeem* issue—we request that the defense be permitted to file a reply brief of no longer than 20 pages on or before March 8, 2023. We request this enlargement to fairly respond to the prosecution's February 16, 2023 brief, which contains approximately 33 substantive pages of argument in response to the defense's 25-page opening brief.

After Mr. Greenwood's plea proceeding on December 16, 2022, the defense proposed, and the Court adopted, a three-stage process for narrowing and determining the issues remaining in the case. The first stage consists of briefing issues relating to *Azeem* (i.e., whether the sentencing guidelines should be calculated based on U.S.-nexus or worldwide conduct). After an extension was granted, the defense timely submitted its brief, which complied with the Court's 25-page limitation, on January 25, 2023. The prosecution's opposition brief filed on February 16, 2023, contained 30 numbered pages, 27 of which were substantive. Three pages at the end of the prosecution's brief contain 16 single-spaced bullet-point arguments. Accordingly, the total substantive portions of the prosecution's brief amounts to approximately 33 double-spaced pages. The prosecution did not seek advance permission from the Court to file a brief exceeding the Court's 25-page limit.

In order for the defense to fairly respond to the prosecution's oversized brief, we request that the defense be permitted to file a reply brief on or before March 8, 2023 of no more than



20 pages. As noted above, the prosecution consents to this request, provided the defense note in this letter request that the prosecution may seek to file a sur-reply.¹

In the event the Court grants this letter motion request to extend the deadline to file a reply brief to March 8, 2023, we respectfully request that the scheduled March 9, 2023 oral argument date likewise be adjourned to a date convenient to the Court after the reply brief is filed. I would be grateful if the adjourned oral argument date is *not* scheduled for the week of March 20-24, as I will be out of the country that week.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Justin S. Weddle'. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Justin S. Weddle

¹ The defense is not here consenting to the filing of a sur-reply and requests the opportunity to respond to any such request. The prosecution's oversized brief justifies the relief sought herein, but provides no basis for shifting to the prosecution the last opportunity to file a brief relating to this matter, nor does it warrant providing to the prosecution additional pages of argument (in a sur-reply) beyond the 33 the prosecution has already submitted.